D618
C532

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

The Divinity School News

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Vol. XVII AUGUST 1, 1950 No. 3

Published quarterly by the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, 5801 Ellis Ave., February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1. Entered as second-class matter, March 29, 1934, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of February 28, 1925, authorized April 18, 1934.

LOVE AND LAW AND "THE GOOD OLD CAUSE"

(Scripture Lesson: JER. 32:1–25; 37:11–21)

NOT long ago there appeared in the *Information Bulletin* of the U.S.S.R. an article by a Russian journalist, praising the music of the composer, Aram Khachaturian. In the next issue of the *Bulletin* there appeared an article that described the earlier article as, in effect, subversive of the best interests of the Soviet state. This second article was written by Khachaturian himself. Combining self-castigation with a boundless patriotism, the composer asserts that, so far from being worthy of praise, he has been unfaithful to the ideals of the fatherland: the Soviet government had laid down rules of composition for Soviet composers, but he had shamelessly violated them.

What was Khachaturian's crime? "The roads to error are many," the composer writes. "The one which I took . . . endeavored by artificial means to unite simultaneously the eleven-voiced sound of the wind instruments with the voice of an instrument such as the organ. I went to an extreme, and the result was an unnecessary conglomeration of sounds. Instead of upholding the tradition of Russian music, I followed a formalistic path alien to the Soviet artist." As a consequence of this deviation, he says, he was properly censured by the Soviet people (meaning, of course, the Soviet government). He concludes his confession with the bending of the knee: "I hope that my future work will give evidence that I have rightly understood the beneficial criticism of my great people." The superpatriots have cracked the whip, and the composer pipes to their tune.

Political and church history, especially in periods of severe conflict, is replete with zealots bent upon ferreting out those who are subversive of national or ecclesiastical solidarity. The story of the inquisition of the innocent victims appears not only in the *Information Bulletin* of the U.S.S.R. or in the pages of the *Congressional Record* or in the tomes that record church history.

It appears also as the red thread that runs through the Bible. For many of the great men of the Bible were subversive in the sense that they did not identify the will of God with the will of the men who held the reins of power; subversive in the sense that they called "unjust" what the pious called "just"; subversive in that they proclaimed a law that is higher than the lawlessness of the patriots; subversive in the sense that they served a power that is stronger than tribalism.

How familiar a pattern in history, and in our own time, is the one that caught Jeremiah, the pattern that brands nonconformity as treason. Jeremiah was a disturber of conscience: he had condemned the unrighteousness of his own people; in the face of military danger he had predicted the doom of the nation. He had gone even further. Believing that restoration would follow the punishment of the nation, he purchased from his relatives the ancestral home at Anathoth, four miles outside Jerusalem, in territory controlled by the Babylonians, who were laying siege to the city. The tribal patriots were much pleased. They could now call him subversive; they now had a pretext to accuse him of treason, to imprison him and get him out of the way.

There is nothing that assists sheer power as against principle better than hysteria arising out of intense social conflict. Hysteria of this sort frightens whole groups of people into a stampede of suppression; and it frightens many victims into submission.

We can observe this sort of hysteria again and again in the annals of Protestantism. The hysteria has appeared in situations very similar to the one that Jeremiah confronted, and the devices of the modern patriots have been similar to those used against Jeremiah. At certain critical moments in the history of Protestantism the accusations and the suppressions growing out of hysteria have crippled the prophetic and creative forces in both church and state. For example, up until the time of the French Revolution and Napoleon, Nonconformity in England was in many ways a profoundly prophetic movement, providing courageous leadership and support for the extension of freedom and justice. But, during the disturbances in France at the end of the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth, many of the Dissenting churches were frightened into a socially indifferent pietism from which they have not yet recovered on any broad front. Because of the known republicanism and the Whig background of Nonconformity, the Tories were able to stir up the fears of the country and of the Nonconformist church people against the infiltration of dangerous thoughts into their ranks. In 1792, when Price and Priestley by their support of republicanism brought the Unitarians under

attack, the aristocracy and the populace combined against the whole group and called them "traitors." Chapels were sacked, congregations dared not meet. Tory politicians and Anglican bishops were not slow to take advantage of the unpopularity of the democratic Dissenters, to the detriment of Nonconformity as a whole. Canning, in his *Anti-Jacobin Magazine,* anticipated the devices familiar to us in the Hearst-McCormick press. In every radical critic of the standing order he saw either "a Dissenter or a former Dissenter or a friend of Dissenters." Writing of this wave of hysteria, Halévy in his *History of England in 1815* reports:

> In the associations recently formed by the Independents and Baptists to organize an itinerant ministry Canning saw a scheme plotted by political societies to preach under the disguise of Christianity, republicanism, Deism, perhaps even Atheism. Bishop Horsley of Rochester, in a famous charge, attacked the Methodists as conscious or unconscious agents of the Atheistic and Jacobin propaganda. What, he asked, was the true character of these religious or apparently religious societies which met every evening in the towns and country villages? of these fanatical and uneducated preachers? "The Jacobins of this country," he says, "the Jacobins I very much fear, are at this moment making a tool of Methodism just as the illuminées of Bavaria make a tool of free-masonry; while the real Methodist, like the real Freemason, is kept in utter ignorance of the wicked enterprise the counterfeit has in hand."

What the bishop was really saying was this: "Don't imagine that those Methodists are holding prayer meeting on Wednesday evenings. They are plotting revolution." In this fashion the "right-thinking patriots" forced many a timid Khachaturian to bend the knee and to renounce "alien" ideas.

Already in 1790 Edmund Burke, in his attack on the Unitarian Dr. Price, had criticized those churches that permitted the minister even to discuss political and social-ethical issues. He urged that what he called "political theologians" should be discouraged from proclaiming their views from the pulpit. Here are his words:

> Politics and the pulpit are terms that have little agreement. No sound ought to be heard in the church but the healing voice of Christian charity. The cause of civil liberty and civil government gains as little as that of religion by this confusion of duties. . . . Surely the church is a place where one day's truce ought to be allowed to the dissensions and animosities of mankind [Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the French Revolution*].

On these principles Burke would prevent the churches from "meddling" with the discussion of the rights of man.

The barrage of "antisubversive" artillery fire directed at the Dissenting churches had the intended effect. British Nonconformity during this period lost much of the democratic dynamic that had characterized its earlier struggle

for liberty in church and state. It became a new form of conformity, a conformity to what is euphemistically called "established order." A "no-politics rule," "political quietism," became the servant of conservatism—in the guise of neutrality.

Essentially the same story may be told concerning the American Protestant churches of the time. In the years preceding the American Revolution, many of these churches were in the forefront of the struggle for democracy and for the rule of law in the Commonwealth. After the French Revolution, "political theologians" increasingly were frowned upon. An American form of pietism developed in reaction against the allegedly subversive deism and the political theology that were associated in the popular mind with French rationalism, infidelity, and revolution. In many quarters "political quietism" and "loyalty" became synonymous.

In our own day the fear of Russia and of her ideology has again become the tool of the superpatriots. Critics of even undemocratic practices in the United States are accused of going over to the enemy. In the name of "Americanism" every sort of bullying is attempted. Even due process of law is ignored. Hearsay—something inadmissible in a court of law—figures as "evidence." Senator McCarthy under the cloak of senatorial immunity can, with impunity, repudiate the rule of law. Some time ago he announced that he had a long list of Communists in government service. First the list numbered 205, then 81, then 57, and, finally, 1; then it went up again. Week after week the senator has recklessly and irresponsibly accused his victims; men have been "tried" not by law but by the ordeal of headlines.

In apparently legal fashion the attorney-general has issued a list of subversive organizations. Yet the organizations branded as "subversive" have had no opportunity to secure a legal hearing. In the minds of many, the "principle" of guilt by association is adopted as a proper basis for the accusation of disloyalty.

One must, to be sure, recognize that, for reasons of security, basic safeguards of the national interest must be established to protect certain key positions in government. But this is no justifiable basis for subjecting government employees to the intimidation and indignity of wild tongues as though these employees were second-class citizens.

Nor is it a justification for subjecting employees in the civil service to illegal scrutiny and control. The first rule adopted by the Civil Service Commission, back in 1884, reads as follows: "No question in any form of application or in any examination shall be so framed as to elicit information concerning the

political or religious opinions or affiliations of any applicant; nor shall any enquiry be made concerning such opinions or affiliations, and all disclosures thereof shall be discountenanced." Yet here are some of the questions asked at loyalty examinations: What do you think of the third party formed by Henry Wallace? Is your wife a churchgoer? Do you read many books? Do you believe that Negro blood should be segregated in the Red Cross blood bank? Which newspapers do you read? Would you say that your wife has liberal political viewpoints? (Henry Steel Commager, *New York Times,* Magazine Section, June 26, 1949.)

This sort of heresy-hunting is familiar to every student of church history. In the name of loyalty it serves to proscribe the ideas that the belligerent, bullying forces in the community may not happen to like. In many communities today the belligerent, bullying force is of the sort that can be symbolized by the name of William Randolph Hearst.

The state of California does not by law impose any political test upon its teachers, beyond the oath to support the Constitution (required of other state employees). In fact, the state Constitution asserts that "no oath, declaration, or test, shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust." Yet the president and the board of regents of the University of California have demanded that every employee in the university shall state under oath (or in a contractual letter) that he is not a member of the Communist party or of any other organization that advocates the overthrow of the United States government. Six faculty members have been dismissed because they have refused to say whether or not they are members of the Communist party. The legitimacy of the procedure has not yet been tested at court of law.

It should be noted that the demand imposed by the board of regents ignores the fact that a Communist will readily sign the non-Communist oath. Hence the oath provides little, if any, protection against Communists. As the *New York Times* says (editorial, June 26, 1950), the genuine test of loyalty "is not a mouthful of words—it is in the character and personality, the observed teaching, of the faculty member."

Extra-legal or high-handed methods have been adopted also beyond the spheres of government and higher education. One example, from the sphere of the churches, will suffice to illustrate the revival of the pattern of hysteria approved over a century ago by the bishop of Rochester. The minister of a church in Peoria, Illinois, who is said to be an American Legion chaplain, a few months ago demanded that the director of Christian education in the parish should give up her friendship with a nurse who had been discharged from her

position as instructor in nursing at a church-sponsored hospital in Peoria. Both women are members of the church served by the minister. The nurse had been discharged from her position at the hospital without notice or explanation. An official of the hospital later asserted that she is a radical and an agitator and thus she could not be kept at the hospital. (She had joined and had been active in the Progressive party.)

In face of the minister's demand that she give up her friendship with her fellow-churchmember, the director replied that her choice of friends was a matter for her own decision; as a consequence, she lost her job (she "resigned"). Subsequently, the nurse has learned from an officer in the Americanism program of the American Legion that she was considered to be either a Communist or a friend of Communists; that it did not make much difference which; that the Legion had decided there was not sufficient room in Peoria for both the Legion and the Communists and their friends; and that the Legion intended to remain in Peoria.

In response to a formal request from the nurse, a denominational commission was appointed to make an investigation of the minister's dismissal of the director of Christian education. The commission reported that "there has been a not unreasonable inference, a very real and injurious malignment of [the director's] character, resulting from the abruptness of her resignation exacted by threat of dismissal, without a reasonable explanation being given both to her and the members of the church; that many of the difficulties might have been avoided if [the executive body of the church] had not erred in failing to recognize its moral, spiritual and legal obligation to grant [the director] the hearing which she rightfully requested." Despite the commission's exhortation to "brotherly kindness," neither of the women has been given a formal hearing by the local church. Instead, a denominational official (it is said) has urged the director to drop the whole matter, since nothing can be done.

* * *

We often hear it asserted that a wellspring of modern democracy is the Judeo-Christian conception of the divinely derived dignity of man. The assertion can be supported cogently.

But the dignity becomes an airy nothing unless it is protected by the respect for law and by the procedures of legitimate legal institutions. The dignity of the child of God cannot be maintained by a figure of speech. Nor can it be maintained by sentiment, not even by the sentiment of love.

Jeremiah and other Old Testament prophets envisaged the will of God as demanding justice. Like love, justice does not become incarnate through simple

proclamation. Justice requires just institutions; just attitudes alone are not sufficient. The ideals of justice promoted by the prophets were plowed into history by the Ezras and the Nehemiahs, by the legalists who defined the rights and duties of the nation and of individuals and who elicited loyalty to the institutions that maintain these rights and duties. The prophets provided the consuming vision of Israel, but the law served to give body to the vision.

Jesus affirmed a love that was not to destroy but to fulfil the law. He repudiated the small matters of the law; but the love he offered presupposed the fundamental law before it could fulfil it or go beyond it. A gospel of charity apart from this law is no longer the gospel of love—it is a pious form of irresponsibility. Love may criticize and attempt to enlarge the conceptions of law and justice, but it does not demand something less than these. According to any conception of love that is fully responsible, not only does the Good Samaritan have the duty of personally assisting the victim of lawlessness; he also has the duty of bringing about the enforcement of the law that stops the thievery.

Modern Protestantism, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, began as a protest against tyranny. In making this protest, it demanded a law that would bring tyranny to account. This demand is what John Milton and other radical Protestants of the seventeenth century called the "Good Old Cause." They said the cause was "GOOD because it hath a tendency to the securing of people's just rights, liberties, properties, privileges and immunities against tyranny, arbitrariness and oppression; OLD because anciently and originally all power was in the people" (*The Good Old Cause Explained* [1659]). From this Protestant support of the Good Old Cause issued our modern democracy, with its principles of the rule of law, of equality before the law, and of the consent of the governed. By this Good Old Cause kings and bishops and superpatriots were brought to book.

But tyranny, the rule of naked power, the rule of the arbitrary, reappears; it assumes new forms. Equality before the law, as we have seen, is today again jeopardized by the hysteria that identifies heretics and traitors by resort to the methods of Senator McCarthy, to the methods of the "Christians" in Peoria—that is, to accusation without duly attested evidence, to arbitrary demand and coercion.

Any Christian or any church that does not oppose these tyrannies assists them. The church that considers the issues here involved to be "controversial" and therefore keeps silent is worse than the Levite that passes by on the other side; it helps the thieves.

This is the kind of aloofness and neutrality of which we are wont to call the Germans guilty. They were responsible for Hitler, we say. Why, then, are we not guilty if we remain silent and impotent in the face of lawlessness? How can we say that we are not guilty for the ravages of hysteria among us?

Is there any doubt that the time has come for American Protestantism to learn again that the Good Old Cause is the cause of Christian love, of the love that cherishes law and justice as well as charity and meekness?

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS
Federated Theological Faculty

JOSEPH BOND CHAPEL
June 27, 1950

RECOGNITION FOR WILLIAM A. IRWIN

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—On May 8, 1950, the New Testament Club of the Divinity School honored Dr. William A. Irwin at a special program in recognition of his many years as a scholar and religious leader. As a part of the recognition program, papers were read by Dr. Harold R. Willoughby and Dr. Joseph Mihelic. We are publishing herewith these two papers, so that the many alumni and friends of the Divinity School and of Dr. Irwin may have some part with the school in the recognition which was extended to Dr. Irwin at that time.]

WHAT my colleagues most desire me to do this evening, and what I most desire to do, is to express simply and clearly some of the main reasons why we are very grateful to Professor and Mrs. Irwin for the twenty good years that they have invested with us in common enterprise here. That cannot be done at all comprehensively or in detail in just the few minutes allotted to this talk. The best we can do is to mention only a few of the main reasons why we are grateful to them for being with us and for working with us. If we must select only a few chief points to emphasize, here are three or four special reasons for gratitude that, as members of the Biblical Field, we wish particularly to underscore at this time.

In the first place, we are especially grateful to Professor and Mrs. Irwin for the creation of the Biblical Field itself, of which we are a part and in which we work together. Of course, we all realize that the bright idea of setting up the Biblical Field within the Divinity Faculty was initially proposed by Dean Shirley Jackson Case in his 1933 reorganization of that faculty. But the one who actually created the Biblical Field as a functioning entity and made it a conspicuously effective working unit, in which the Old Testament Department and the New Testament Department really work together for common biblical ends, was William Andrew Irwin. It was his child by adoption and rearing. For a decade and a half now, he and Mrs. Irwin have brought it up to its present vigorous and healthy state. More than most of us do or can realize, that was an extremely difficult thing to accomplish. That the Biblical Field is today an efficient operating

unit and that it can become considerably more significant than it is today are ample reasons for great gratitude to Professor and Mrs. Irwin, not only on the part of the members of the Biblical Field itself but also on the part of the Federated Faculty.

In the second place, we are grateful to Professor Irwin for exemplifying the importance and meaning of well-balanced and comprehensive biblical scholarship. Some professors there are who succeed in learning more and more about less and less. And some there are who equally succeed in learning less and less about more and more. Few are the professors who actually succeed in learning more and more about more and more. Professor Irwin has won his place among these few. His scholarship is noteworthy alike for detailed masteries and for comprehensive import. In times like the present, which are characterized by extreme specialization, on the one hand, and also by extreme generalization, on the other hand, to maintain such balance between the two is very important indeed.

That is one reason why we, as biblical students, particularly appreciate the inductive study of *The Problem of Ezekiel* by William A. Irwin. As the student works through that volume, he realizes that the biblical scholar must not only be a competent linguist, and he must not only be a good literary critic, or a social historian, or a capable theologian, or a well-balanced psychologist, or a comparative religionist, or an archeologist; but he must be all these, all at once and all the time. All that is the enormous demand of biblical scholarship. We thank you, Professor Irwin, for making that plain to us.

In the third place, we are grateful to Professor Irwin for demonstrating to us how the revision of books can be made an important scholarly process. It is many times more difficult to revise an old book than to write a new book, especially if the old book was written by someone else. In all the world there is scarcely a more onerous or thankless task than to revise a book written by someone else. The revision must be true to the original author—that goes without saying. Also the reviser must be true to himself—that, too, goes without saying. But what if the reviser disagrees with the original author, as frequently he should disagree?

Professor Irwin has shown exactly what should be done under such circumstances. 'Tis said that in one chapter of one of the famous Irwin revisions, all that now remains of the original chapter is just one single, solitary reference to it. In the words of "The Awfully Meek" of Toronto: "This is revision with a vengeance!" This drastic quality gives to the Irwin revisions their character and their scholarly significance.

Professor Irwin, we are grateful to you for your revisions; for the useful books that you choose to revise; and for the thoroughgoing way in which you handled the problems of revision presented by these books.

In the fourth place, we are grateful to you for the fine example you have set the rest of us in making the results of scholarship available for general public understanding and use. You have taught

as energetically in church schools as in university classes. You have prepared public lectures as carefully as you have university seminars. To both clauses of our challenging university motto you have accorded equal devotion: *Crescat scientia: vita excolatur:* "Let knowledge grow to more and more, and so be human life enriched!"

In this connection we are endlessly proud of the work you have done and are doing and will continue to do on the Revised Standard Version of the Bible. Here you follow in the footsteps not only of your former chief, J. M. P. Smith, and the translators of *The Complete Bible: An American Translation* but also in the footsteps of those who produced the great authorized series of English Bibles from the Great Bible of 1539 down to the Revised Standard Version of the present. When you and your colleagues have finished your work, we shall then look forward to a continuing series of periodic revisions of the American Standard Version, generation after generation, on and on, into the future.

Thus far we have said not a word about how sorry we are that you and Mrs. Irwin are leaving Chicago and moving to S.M.U. in Dallas. I do not exaggerate when I say that to some of us your leaving Chicago at just this time seems a major disaster. Will you not kindly allow us to leave that matter just there and not say more about it at present?

Much rather we would prefer to think of *our* loss as *your* gain and the gain of Perkins School of Theology in S.M.U. That situation we know well, and we have great confidence in it. With you and the Sweets there and with all the other Chicagoans who are there at present or who will doubtless go there in the future, we have no hesitancy in regarding it as one of the most promising theological situations in all the American scene today. We are glad and proud that you are to have a part in it. And so we say not only "Auf Wiedersehen," but also and very heartily "Bon Voyage" for the new venture that is just ahead.

HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY

MR. TOASTMASTER, HONORED GUESTS, AND FRIENDS: My acquaintance with Professor Irwin began in 1935. Professor Herbert Gordon May, of Oberlin, where I was studying, would frequently mention Professor Irwin and other faculty members of the University of Chicago in his Old Testament lectures. I met Dr. Irwin personally in Cleveland, Ohio, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in 1937. Seeing him there, giving a paper on the famous "Almah" passage from Isaiah and then defending his position with a brilliant and scholarly discourse, impressed me greatly. I decided right then and there that, should an opportunity come for me to take additional studies at the University of Chicago, most of my work would be under Professor Irwin. About a year later, my wish came true. I became a student of Dr. Irwin.

During my three years under his professorial guidance, I came to look upon him not only as a great scholar, an effective teacher, and a Christian gentleman but also as a warm personal friend. These

qualities of Professor Irwin left an indelible mark upon me. They became for me a criterion by which I judged and evaluated my own performance as a teacher in subsequent years. With your permission, I should like to dwell briefly on each of these three qualities of our mutual friend.

Professor Irwin's scholarly attainments are well known to everyone here. His various articles, books, and book reviews have won for him an international reputation as an Old Testament scholar. It has become a habit with me that whenever I obtain a book on the Old Testament published abroad, the first thing I do is to check the Index to see what American scholarly productions have been utilized in the writing of the particular volume. As you all know, Continental scholars are rather slow in recognizing American scholarship, and therefore few American scholars receive such citations. You can imagine my delight when in the recent book on the introduction to the Old Testament by the Danish scholar, Aage Bentzen, Professor Irwin's contributions to Old Testament studies are given well-deserved recognition.

However, those of us who have been privileged to sit at his feet as his students have been the real beneficiaries of Dr. Irwin's scholarship. His scholarly pursuits are not limited only to his chosen field but also include all the related fields of the ancient Near East. Yet, as I recall, at no time did he attempt to impress us with the vastness of his learning. On the contrary, when the occasion called for it, he would invite experts of other fields to lecture to us. For example, in a course on textual criticism, he persuaded Dr. Heidel, who had made a study of the Ethiopic language, to come to the class and give us a lecture on the subject under discussion. He admitted his limitations on the particular subject and referred us to the authorities in the field, always giving credit to whom credit was due. This intellectual honesty and humility made a profound impression on his students. It made us realize that no one man can hope to become an expert in every field and that one must be content to know well but a small segment of human knowledge.

In his lectures I never heard him make a disparaging remark about those who openly disagreed with him. I remember an occasion when Professor Irwin and Keith Andrews, now Professor Andrews of Knox College, Toronto, became involved in a rather warm discussion over a textual problem. I don't recall who won out in that controversy, but I do remember that the episode passed without hard feelings on either side. For me that particular incident had a valuable lesson. It showed me that a true scholar is devoid of prejudice and resentments, even when his particular opinion or position is challenged by his own students. Such is our mutual friend whom we honor tonight: broad in learning, yet humble; liberal in his thought, yet firm in his convictions; profound in his thinking, yet lucid in his expession. That these qualities made him an effective and interesting teacher is obvious. He is able to inspire his students to think for themselves and to think courageously. He would take a problem, explain it briefly, discuss the opinions of

other scholars, and then let the students grapple with it, all the while encouraging them to search further for themselves. In his kindly, tactful—shall I say "Irwin-esque"?—way he would show us wherein we failed to grasp the point, or wherein we were shallow in our thinking, or wherein we were too subjective in our opinions. It was truly a joy to study the Hebrew prophets with him, especially Ezekiel, with whose problems he was then wrestling. The results of his findings are now in book form. In this connection, I should like to mention an interesting incident that took place shortly after Professor Irwin's book on Ezekiel came out. I placed the book on the reading list for my course on the Hebrew prophets. The book caused quite a furor among my students, especially among those of the fundamentalist persuasion. Later in the spring, I took a group of my students to the Oriental Institute, where they also met Professor Irwin. When they were introduced to him, as the professor who wrote *that* book on Ezekiel, their faces must have registered astonishment, but he made them feel at home immediately by saying, "Yes, I am he, and, as you can see, I have no horns."

Or what shall I say of other subjects which we have been privileged to study under him: textual criticism, advanced Hebrew grammar, pre-exilic legalism, Wisdom literature, and the Book of Job, which to study under him was a never-to-be-forgotten experience. Those of you who have never had this opportunity may receive a taste of what it was to study Job under Dr. Irwin's inspired guidance by reading his article, "Job and Prometheus," in the current issue of the *Journal of Religion*. In this article our mutual friend reveals himself not only as a great scholar and a penetrating thinker but also as a man with the sensitive soul of a poet. Thus as a teacher he helped us not only to broaden and deepen our knowledge of the Old Testament but also to love and to appreciate this repository of Hebrew learning as the revealed Word of God. Although his approach in the study of the Old Testament was scientific and critical, yet he never ignored its great religious value. Being himself a deeply religious man, he preached the spiritual truth of the Book by personal example. One need not be in his presence very long before realizing him to be every inch a Christian gentleman.

Before I came to the University of Chicago, I was warned by a fellow-minister that I was going to a godless institution which would try to rob me of my religious faith. Since that time I have met others who hold the same false view. Yet in all truthfulness I must say that what my teachers at the University of Chicago took away was my credulity and ignorance, and in their place they gave me an intelligent and rational basis for my religious faith. And Professor Irwin had no small share in this reorientation of my religious faith.

Another misconception about the University of Chicago is that it is a cold, intellectual place, where only brains count and where the milk of human kindness is frozen and put away in deep freeze. Our experience—my wife's and mine—has been very different. In the

Irwins, Olmsteads, Colwells, Bowmans, and other faculty members we found a warm and friendly reception. We were strangers, but, instead of being met with an indifferent attitude and a cold stare, we were received as friends, invited to their homes, and treated as old acquaintances. Our experience was not unusual. It was commonplace, because other students received the same attention as we did. After we left Chicago, Lydia and I often recalled the many happy times that we had had at the Irwins and at the homes of other faculty members.

I count it, therefore, a privilege to have this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to Professor Irwin for his part in molding and shaping my intellectual life, and to Mrs. Irwin and to all the other faculty members and their wives for their gracious hospitality, which helped in making our student life at the University of Chicago such a happy experience.

With your departure, Dr. and Mrs. Irwin, from these halls of learning where you have labored so faithfully for twenty years, this place will not seem the same to us. Those of us who have come to know, to love, and to associate you with this institution will miss you on our periodic visits to it. But we assure you that your contribution to the intellectual greatness of this institution and the influence of your personality upon those of us who have been your students and friends will not be forgotten. We shall often think of you, and we shall pray that He who blessed your labors with success here will also continue to bless you and your family in your new field of labor.

JOSEPH MIHELIC

NOTES FROM THE DEAN'S OFFICE

Many of our alumni and friends have been concerned about our developing a more comprehensive program for cultivating the churches. They have also been concerned that the Divinity School should be interested to relate itself more effectively and closely to the alumni and all institutions that are in the kind of work that the Divinity School is trying to do today. In response to this concern we are pleased to announce that, as of October 1 of this year, we will have on our administrative staff a full-time person who will have the responsibility of developing the Divinity School's relationship with the churches, the alumni, and all supporting institutions. The person whom we are calling to this position is Mr. William N. Weaver, who will have the title of Assistant to the Dean. He will be directly responsible to and in constant conversation with Dean Loomer regarding all aspects of his work.

William Weaver is an ordained minister of the Disciples of Christ, has served many years in the active ministry, including five years as a chaplain in the United States Army, and has been a student in the Divinity School for the last four years. We believe that he is fully aware of the situation in the churches today in America and, therefore, is able to understand the problems and responsibilities that are involved in relating the Divinity School academically, ecclesiastically, and professionally to the churches

and the other supporting institutions. You will be hearing more from and about him as time goes by, but we wanted to make this announcement at this time.

REGISTRATION

The registration in the Federated Theological Schools for the Spring Quarter was 255. Of this total number, 126 were registered in the Divinity School, 93 in the Chicago Theological Seminary, 19 in the Disciples Divinity House, and 17 in the Meadville Theological School.

CONVOCATION

At Spring Convocation, June 16, 1950, the following degrees were conferred:

Master of Arts

OWEN MILTON WEATHERLY

Thesis: A Comparative Study of the Social Ethics of Walter Rauschenbusch and Reinhold Niebuhr

Doctor of Philosophy

GILBERT GERALD HARROP

Thesis: Tradition and Dissent in the Eighth-Century Prophets and Jeremiah

EDWARD GRAHAM WARING, JR.

Thesis: Philosophical Aspects of Recent Anglo-Catholic Thought

ALUMNI NEWS

MEMORIALS

Mr. Nelson A. Harkness, B.D. '10, passed away on Friday, April 21, 1950. He had lived for some years in Vancouver, B.C., and had had pastorates in that city and Halifax, N.S. He also served as executive secretary for the British and Foreign Bible Society in the Province of British Columbia. Mr. Harkness was born in Sarnia, Ontario, September, 1880.

PERSONALS

Beginning this fall, Mr. G. Gerald Harrop, Ph.D. '50, will become sessional lecturer in biblical studies at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

Harold A. Bosley, Ph.D. '33, dean of Duke Divinity School and minister-elect of the First Methodist Church in Evanston, recently made the "Talk of the Town" section in the *New Yorker* with the following bulletin board notice:

ATTENTION: Any member of the student body or faculty of the Divinity School seeing a flying saucer is requested to clear with me before reporting same to the press.

HAROLD A. BOSLEY, *Dean*

A current issue of the *Proceedings* of the Oklahoma Academy of Science includes an analysis of "Santayana's Interpretation of the Triumph of Christianity," by Eugene S. Tanner, Ph.D. '34. Dr. Tanner is chairman of the Department of Religion at the University of Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Thomasine Allen, M.A. '28, reports from Japan. She is serving as a Northern Baptist missionary in Kuji, Iwate Ken, Japan, doing Christian social-center work.

Harris Learner Latham, M.A. '09, clinical psychologist at Manteno State Hospital in Manteno, Illinois, has recently been doing research under the direction of Irwin A. Berg, secretary of the Illinois Psychological Association, on the

subject of "The Symbols and Controlling Concepts of the Rorschach Inkblot Test."

Ralph E. Bayes, '29, left San Francisco with Mrs. Bayes on May 26 for a trip around the world on the liner "President Polk." He has done extensive traveling in Japan, India, and Egypt.

The president of Northland College in Wisconsin, Lewis H. Brumbaugh, M.A. '19, reports that the college will be erecting a new industrial arts building this summer. Mr. Brumbaugh completed his Ph.D. work at the University of Pittsburgh.

Errorism in the Early Church, by Selby Vernon McCasland, Ph.D. '26, is currently being published by the Macmillan Company. Dr. McCasland is professor of religion in the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, Virginia.

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., Ph.D. '37, now professor of church history in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is teaching this summer in the graduate school of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee.

The new dean of Yankton College, in Yankton, South Dakota, is Adolph Schock, Ph.D. '31. For the last six years Mr. Schock has been head of the Department of Philosophy and Psychology and also assumed the duties of registrar four years ago. He will continue with those functions in addition to being dean.

Nine members of the Princeton University faculty have been appointed Bicentennial Preceptors for the next three years. Among these nine members there is one Divinity School alumnus, A. Leland Jamison, Ph.D. '41. These appointments are the first to be announced under a recently initiated program to provide outstanding young men the opportunity to advance in both teaching effectiveness and scholarship.

Huston Smith, Ph.D. '45, was among four members of the faculty of Washington University to be made honorary members of Omicron Delta Kappa, national Senior men's honorary fraternity.

Having served twenty-four years as a teacher, Mr. George W. Fogg, B.D. '07, has recently retired from his position in the department of the social sciences in the Bay City, Michigan, public school system. Prior to teaching, Mr. Fogg was a pastor for eighteen years in churches in several midwestern states.

The new pastor of Central Methodist Church in Fort Worth, Texas, is Mr. Erwin F. Bohmfalk, '49. He served the First Methodist Church in Corsicana, Texas, for eight years prior to his new pastorate.

John T. McNeill, Ph.D. '20, at present Auburn Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, received an honorary doctorate (D.D.) from the University of Edinburgh this June. In the early autumn Dr. McNeill is scheduled to give the important Chancellor Lectures at Queen's Theological College in Kingston, Ontario. His theme will be "The Major Movements in Current Christianity."

S. M. Gilmour, Ph.D. '37, is currently publishing a translation of *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt* by Hans Windisch through the Westminster Press of Philadelphia. Dr. Gilmour is professor of New Testa-

ment in Queen's Theological College in Kingston, Ontario.

On May 30, 1950, William H. Bernhardt, Ph.D. '28, was awarded an honorary D.Litt. degree from Nebraska Wesleyan University.

Jas. T. Carlyon, Ph.D. '26, has recently had a book published entitled *Our Favorite Sermons*. He is completing four years as radio preacher of WFAA in Dallas, Texas.

Fred J. Jackson, M.A. '41, has recently been called to the Ker-Tapleytown Pastoral Charge near Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, from Horning Mills (United Church of Canada).

Apostle of Liberty, by Arnold Crompton, M.A. '39, will be published in October of this year. Mr. Crompton is at present vice-president of the Pacific Coast Section of the American Society of Church History and vice-president of the Board of Trustees of the Starr King School for the Ministry in Berkeley, California.

James J. Raun, Ph.D. '30, on June 1, 1950, was elected dean of Northwestern Lutheran Seminary in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Since 1938 he has been head of the Department of Systematic Theology at this seminary and will continue as such in addition to his new position.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Sherman are the parents of a baby boy, born June 13, 1950. Mr. Sherman attended the Divinity School in 1943.

Jean Louise Smith, M.A. '36, is at present the editor of children's publications for the Board of Christian Education and Publication of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

The resident bishop of the Methodist church in Lucknow, India, is Clement D. Rockey, Ph.D. '29. Bishop Rockey has been in this position since 1941.

ATTENTION ALUMNI!

Help us to make our alumni records more complete. The Alumni Association urges every alumnus to send information about himself or other alumni. Please fill in this blank and return it to the Office of Extension, Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Name.....Address.....

U. of C. degrees.....Year.....

Other Degrees.....Institutions.....Year.....

Mailing address.....

New pastorate or other position.....

.....

.....

Book published.....

Election to position of honor or responsibility.....

Interesting project recently accomplished.....

Any other information of interest.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

[PRINTED IN U.S.A.]